

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senators from Utah and Maryland for their hospitality.

S. 891 "THE FAMILY IMPACT STATEMENT ACT OF 1997"

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, last Thursday, June 12, I along with Senators DEWINE, FAIRCLOTH, HUTCHINSON, COATS, COVERDELL, and ASHCROFT cosponsored S. 891, Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM's Family Impact Statement Act of 1997. I rise today in strong support of this important piece of legislation and to voice my complete disagreement with the recent anti-family action taken by President Clinton.

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan, realizing the importance of the American family and the need to be constantly aware of the negative impact that Federal laws and regulations can have on the family, signed Executive Order 12606. The purpose of this order was to ensure that the rights of the family are considered in the construction and carrying out of policies by executive departments and agencies.

Mr. President, even though we are faced with the staggering increase in out-of-wedlock births, rising rates of divorce, and increases in the number of child abuse cases, apparently President Clinton does not believe that considering the impact of Government regulations on families is good policy.

Much to my dismay, on April 21, 1997, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13045, thus stripping the American family any existing protection from harm in the formulation and application of Federal policies.

President Reagan's Executive order placed special emphasis on the relationship between the family and the Federal Government. President Reagan directed every Federal agency to assess all regulatory and statutory provisions "that may have significant potential negative impact on the family well-being." Before implementing any Federal policy, agency directors had to make certain that the programs they managed and the regulations they issued met certain family-friendly criteria. Specifically, they had to ask:

Does this action strengthen or erode the authority and rights of parents in educating, nurturing, and supervising their children?

Does it strengthen or erode the stability of the family, particularly the marital commitment?

Does it help the family perform its function, or does it substitute Government activity for that function?

Does it increase or decrease family earnings, and do the proposed benefits justify the impact on the family budget?

Can the activity be carried out by a lower level of government or by the family itself?

What message, intended or otherwise, does this program send concerning the status of the family?

What message does it send to young people concerning the relationship between their behavior, their personal responsibility, and the norms of our society?

The elimination of President Reagan's Executive order is just the latest in a series of decisions that indicates the Clinton administration's very different approach to family issues. From the outset of President Clinton's first term, it became clear that his administration intended to pursue policies sharply at odds with traditional American moral principles. White House actions have ranged from the incorporation of homosexuals into the military to the protection of partial birth abortion procedures.

Mr. President, many have suggested it is community villages, in other words Government, that raise children. But the real truth is, families raise children. Families are the ones who are there night and day to love, to care for, and to nurture children.

Many bureaucratic regulations produce little benefit, but can have unintended consequences. The examples are too numerous to mention. What our legislation will do is require the regulators to stop and take a moment to think through their regulations to make sure that, the most fundamental institution in civilization—the family, is not damaged by their actions. This is a reasonable and wise policy.

Mr. President, I find it very odd that of all the Executive Orders that exist, President Clinton would reach down and lift this one up for elimination. This body should speak out forcefully on this subject and I am confident we will. The families of America deserve no less.

S. 819, The Family Impact Statement Act of 1997, is a sound and reasonable piece of legislation which will restore a valuable pro-family policy that has been established for ten years.

I urge all my colleagues to stand united, Republicans and Democrats, to show that the preservation of the family is not a partisan issue. Our voices united will send a loud and clear message to the President and to this nation that we consider family protection to be one of America's most important issues and that we will not accept decisions which mark a retreat from our steadfast commitment to our Nation's families.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that American families must be considered when the Federal Government develops and implements policies and regulations that affect families. Therefore, I am honored to be an original cosponsor S. 891 the Family Impact Statement Act of 1997 which will reinstate the pro-family executive order of President Reagan.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Senators ABRAHAM, DEWINE, FAIRCLOTH, HUTCHINSON, COATS, COVERDELL, and ASHCROFT for their dedicated work and help on this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 393

(Purpose: To strike section 2101(g), limiting funding for U.S. memberships in international organizations and requiring withdrawal from organizations which exceed that limitation)

Mr. SARBANES. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] proposes an amendment numbered 393.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 160, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 7 on page 162.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this amendment, referring to pages 160 to 162 of the bill, takes out subsection (g), which is a subsection that puts forward the possibility that the United States might withdraw from the United Nations. I am very frank to tell you that I don't think the prospect of that eventuality ought to be raised in this legislation.

This legislation, in effect, says that if the amount of funds made available for U.S. membership exceed a certain figure, then withdrawal is required. Of course, we determine the amount of funds that are made available. In any event, even if the figure is exceeded, I don't think a withdrawal sanction ought to be incorporated in this legislation. If you stop and think about it, that is quite a sweeping proposition.

Let me quote from paragraph (2) of that subsection:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall withdraw from an international organization. . . .

It then goes on to set out the procedures for doing so, and the deadline for doing so. Let me read for a second.

Unless otherwise provided for in the instrument concerned, a withdrawal under this subsection shall be completed within one year in which the withdrawal is required.

Then it requires the President to submit a report on the withdrawal.

I hope that the managers of the bill, upon reflection, will agree with me that we ought not to be including in the legislation any provisions that carry with them the implication of withdrawal from the United Nations.

The United Nations is too important an organization, and our participation in it is too critical a matter to include in this legislation a provision of this sort. The provision on which I am focusing runs from pages 160 to 162, providing for the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

My amendment is focused on a limited part of this bill. I have a lot of differences with other parts of this bill, as Members well know. I supported the effort earlier in the day to take out the